



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/077,062	02/15/2002	Karl J. Wood	GB010035	1604	
24737 7	590 09/08/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			REKSTAD	REKSTAD, ERICK J	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2613		

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

V
v

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/077,062	WOOD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Erick Rekstad	2613	

	Elick Rekstau	2013	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in completed following time periods: 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	affidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		IKST REPLY WAS FILE	טער אווארוועע כ
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension at CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. tutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any explore a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NC w);	OTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially r	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· · ·	ejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
13. Other:			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that the combination of Uchiyama and Anderson does not teach a single control used to control two stereoscopic parameters. The applicant specifically argues that Anderson teaches two devices (joystick and head mounted unit). The rejection for the claims used only the joystick which is defined by Anderson to control the left/right, forward/backward, and up/down velocities (Col 35 Line 66-Col 36 Line 7). The applicant neglected to include the up/down velocity control in the argument "it should be noted that the control of left/right and forward/backward velocities by the joystick 5005 cannot be deemed to control more than one parameter." (Pages 3 and 4). By further controlling the up/down velocity the joystick infact controls the 2D velocity (left/right and forward/backward) and the 3rd deminional velocity (up/down). Therefore, it is viewed by the examiner that the joystick of Anderson satisfies the controlling of two parameters with a single control as required by the claims.

GIMS PHILIPPE BRIMARY EXAMINER